

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-6 and 15-25 are pending in this application, in which claims 1-6 are allowed, claim 15 is withdrawn, and claims 16-25 are currently under examination. In the Office Action of November 13, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,287,434 ("*Bain*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,517,316 ("*Hube*") and U.S. Patent No. 5,467,434 ("*Hower*").

In response, Applicants have amended claims 16-18 and 20 to further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. Applicants have also canceled claims 19 and 21-25 and added new dependent claims 26-31. No new subject matter has been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found, for example, in FIGS. 45 and 46, at page 134, lines 6 to 10, at page 140, lines 23-25, and at page 160, line 5 to page 162, line 4.

Applicants submit that amended independent claim 16 and dependent claims 17, 18, 20, and 26-31 overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). More specifically, amended independent claim 16 recites "each job information [of a print job prepared by the job scheduling section] includes a current state of the print job and a previous state of the print job." Amended claim 16 additionally requires that "the job scheduling section determines whether or not it is allowed to modify the attribute information of the one of the print jobs based on (i) the queue that stores the job information of the one of the print jobs, (ii) the current state of the one of the print jobs, and (iii) the previous state of the one of the print jobs." Applicants submit that none of *Bain*, *Hube*, and

*Hower* show or suggest that job information prepared for a print job by the job scheduling section includes a previous state as well as a current state of the print job. As a consequence, these references, either alone or in combination, also fail to show or suggest determining whether modification of the attribute information of a print job is allowed based on the queue that stores the job information, the current state of the print job, and the previous state of the print job.

Accordingly, at least because the combination of *Bain*, *Hube*, and *Hower* fails to show or suggest each and every feature of amended independent claim 16, amended claim 16 is non-obvious over this combination. Claims 17, 18, 20, and 26-31 depend from claim 16, and are, therefore, also allowable over the combination of *Bain*, *Hube*, and *Hower* at least because of their dependence on a patentable base claim.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims 16-18, 20, and 26-31 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior art references cited against this application. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 13, 2007

By:   
Cathy C. Ding  
Reg. No. 52,820